ISSN 0703-8763

Edmonton Area Series Report No. 32

ETHNICITY IN EDMONTON:
A STATISTICAL PORTRAIT

By

G. Won Lee

Department of Sociology
The University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
T6G 2H4

The 1978 - 1983 Edmonton Area Study (EAS) were administered and supported by the Population Research Laboratory and the Department of Sociology at The University of Alberta.

April 1984

ABSTRACT

The relationship between ethnic identity and differences in certain attitudes and behaviors is examined using survey data of Edmonton for the period 1978-1983. Although there are socioeconomic differences among various ethnic groups on several dimensions, these gaps between the dominant British and most other ethnic groups are lessening, especially among the younger generation. However, the process toward parity in income was found to be much slower by far for Native People. There are also stable differences in ethnic consciousness. High ethnic consciousness is consistently associated with low social status of an ethnic group. Ethnic differences for factors influencing community affect are also discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The funding for the research was provided by Cultural Heritage Branch, Alberta Culture. The author wishes to thank Dr. R. Petryshyn for his guidance and helpful comments as well as Mr. L. Samuelson for technical assistance. The contents of this paper, however, are the sole responsibility of the author.

I. Introduction

Ethnicity is a complex phenomenon. As such, various research programs employ different approaches when studying ethnicity. Studies regarding segregation and stratification, for instance, focus on the structural dimensions of ethnicity (i.e., ethnic group relations), whereas attitudinal and behavioral studies deal with cultural dimensions of ethnicity (i.e., ethnic identity). In this paper, we will examine the certain key aspects of ethnic identity related to cultural differences in attitudes and behaviors.

Ethnic Identification

The term ethnicity can have a variety of meanings depending upon one's definitional focus. However, it is basically defined as a manifestation of the way people are organized in terms of interaction patterns, institutions, personal values, attitudes, life styles, and presumed consciousness of kind (Yancey et al. 1976). Alternatively, ethnic identity is usually based on a constant ascribed trait that is inherited from the past. However, it is more an outcome of a process which continues to unfold throughout different stages in the life cycle. The measures of ethnic identity thus should reflect this ongoing process of shaping and molding one's identification. In this context, an adequate indicator of ethnic identity is not so much ethnic origin as ethnic identification. Being a descendant of an immigration does not automatically make him or her an ethnic. Moreover, when given a choice, not everybody identifies with his ethnic origin group.

Ethnic identification, or self-placement in terms of ethnic category, has several advantages over ethnic origin as an index of ethnic identity. First, it is predicated upon subjective perception rather than objective classification and thus reflects the dynamics of the process of identification. Secondly, it can also function as a dependent variable, i.e., the less (or more) assimilation and acculturation, the less (or more) identification with origin, whereas ethnic origin can only be a predictor. Thirdly, it is a type of social identification with a reference group and as such possesses more explanatory power. It is well established that social identification with a certain group is more relevant than objective membership in explaining attitudinal and behavioral differentials, because that group's perspective constitutes the frame of reference of the actor. In particular, fluctuations in behavior and attitude as an individual moves from one social context to another can be accounted for in terms of a change in reference groups (Shibutani, 1955; Kuhn, 1964).

This paper will utilize ethnic identification information collected from the Edmonton Area Study (EAS)[1] for the period 1978-1983 as a basis for the analysis of (1) demographic and

---

[1] The Edmonton Area Study is an amalgam survey conducted annually by the Population Research Laboratory at the University of Alberta. The sample was selected from the total population of Edmonton through the use of multi-stage area cluster design. In a family household chosen, either the husband or wife was eligible for interviewing, while in a non-family household any member over 18 years of age was eligible. Because of the concern that women would more likely be at home and thus would be oversampled, interviewers were instructed to obtain an equal number of male and female respondents by requesting to speak to a male in the first contact until a sufficient number of males were obtained. The ratio between male and female for the period 1978-1983 was 50.3: 49.7.

socioeconomic characteristics of ethnic groups in Edmonton and (2) the role of ethnicity in community affect.

II. Demographic Characteristics

1. Ethnic Composition: Census and EAS

Ethnic fragmentation has been one of the outstanding features of Canadian social structure (Porter, 1975). This fact is evident when the ethnic composition of the city of Edmonton is examined. Based upon Canadian Census data, it is obvious that the population of Edmonton exhibits a heterogeneity in terms of reported ethnic origin. Forty percent of the residents are of British origin, 6 percent are French origin, and the remaining 42 percent belongs to a third composite index category.[2] When we use ethnic identification[3] as an index for ethnicity, however, a substantial change in the ethnic composition is noted. The highest proportions of respondents in EAS identify themselves as 'Canadian' [4] (46.5%). Furthermore, Ukrainian and German groups

---

[2] Third ethnics are persons of neither British nor French origin. However, since multiple origins are not included in this category, the sum of first, second, and third ethnics does not add up to 100%. These figures are computed from Table 1. Selected Population, Dwelling, Household and Family Distributions, Showing Selected Social and Economic Characteristics, for Census Tracts, 1981 (Statistics Canada, 1983:1-1).

[3] This is based on the answers to the verbally presented question, "How would you define your ethnic identity?". For research purposes, we group the answers into 22 categories. Those who call themselves Polish-Canadian or Canadian-polish are, for instance, classified under 'Polish'. Therefore, those in the Polish group cannot be said to feel less 'Canadian' than those who call themselves 'Canadian'.

[4] We do not know at this juncture why an individual calls himself 'Canadian' instead of referring to his ethnic origin(s). We presume, however, that those who identify themselves as 'Canadian' are more likely to have identificational assimilation and differ from the rest in terms of attitudes and behaviors.

TABLE 1. ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION IN EDMONTON

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
CANADIAN	1.	1231	46.5	49.2	49.2
BRITISH	2.	413	15.6	16.5	65.7
FRENCH	3.	92	3.5	3.7	69.4
UKRAINIAN	4.	206	7.8	8.2	77.6
ITALIAN	5.	32	1.2	1.3	78.9
GERMAN	6.	144	5.4	5.8	84.6
HUNGARIAN	7.	6	0.2	0.2	84.9
POLISH	8.	38	1.4	1.5	86.4
SCANDINAVIAN	9.	56	2.1	2.2	88.6
N AMERICAN	10.	20	0.8	0.8	89.4
EAST INDIAN	11.	30	1.1	1.2	90.6
DUTCH	12.	34	1.3	1.4	92.0
CZECH	13.	6	0.2	0.2	92.2
JAPANESE	14.	2	0.1	0.1	92.3
CHINESE	15.	42	1.6	1.7	94.0
NATIVE INDIAN	16.	22	0.8	0.9	94.8
AFRICAN	17.	1	0.0	0.0	94.9
RUSSIAN	18.	8	0.3	0.3	95.2
JEWISH	19.	8	0.3	0.3	95.5
OTHER ASIAN	20.	12	0.5	0.5	96.0
OTHER EUROPEAN	21.	27	1.0	1.1	97.1
DUAL	22.	63	2.4	2.5	99.6
DK	88.	10	0.4	0.4	100.0

emerge as the second and third largest, respectively, after the British (see Table 1). In the following sections, the demographic characteristics of the major ethnic groups in EAS will be discussed.

2. Demographic Characteristics

Table 2 presents a distribution of ethnic groups by sex. Most groups are expected to display a near 50:50 split according to the information on ethnic origin in 1981 Census data. Among Europeans [5], Dutch, Hungarians, Russians, and Italians are more likely to be males, whereas German, Polish, and Czech respondents are more likely to be females. This phenomenon may have two explanations: (1) the tendency of men and women to choose certain ethnic identification and/or (2) sampling variation. The possibility of differentials in sex ratios in the population is ruled out, because an even sex ratio is indicated for urban populations in Alberta (Statistics Canada, 1983:Table 3). The very high proportion of males among Oriental[6] groups, however, warrants some special consideration. If we assume that Orientals are likely to be recent immigrants (relative to most European groups), the male bias indicated by the data may be attrituted to sex differences in (1) immigration patterns, (2) language proficiency, or (3) cultural practices which favor males in non-domestic matters.

---

[5]Europeans include everybody but those in the Oriental, Dual, Native People, Canadian, and North American group.
[6]Orientals include Chinese, Japanese, East Indian, and Other Asians.

TABLE 2. DISTRIBUTION OF ETHNIC GROUPS BY SEX (%)

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
CANADIAN	48.7	51.3	1231
BRITISH	49.9	50.1	413
FRENCH	47.8	52.2	92
UKRAINIAN	50.5	49.5	206
ITALIAN	68.8	31.3	32
GERMAN	43.8	56.3	144
HUNGARIAN	83.3	16.7	6
POLISH	44.5	55.3	38
SCANDINAVIAN	42.9	57.1	56
NORTH AMERICAN	45.0	55.0	20
EAST INDIAN	80.0	20.0	30
DUTCH	58.8	41.2	34
CZECH	33.3	66.7	6
JAPANESE	100.0	0.0	2
CHINESE	61.9	38.1	42
NATIVES	50.0	50.0	22
AFRICAN	100.0	0.0	1
RUSSIAN	62.5	37.5	8
JEWISH	75.0	25.0	8
OTHER ASIAN	50.0	50.0	12
OTHER EUROPEAN	51.9	48.1	27
DUALS	54.0	46.0	62
DON'T KNOW	60.0	40.0	10

The marital status of individuals in the various ethnic groups is presented in Table 3. In most groups the majority of members are married. Chinese and Duais[7] are least likely to be married perhaps partially because, as Table 4 shows, they are younger than the rest of the population. The most likely candidates for acculturation such as Canadian, British, French, North American group, indicate a moderate level of participation in common-law relationship. Native People, on the other hand, show the highest proportion of cohabitation (more than legal marriage). These group with higher common-law relationship are also the most likely candidates for marriage dissolution, followed by other ethnics such as Scandinavian and Ukrainian. Among European ethnics, those with high ratio of Catholics such as Polish, Hungarian, Italian are the least likely to be separated or divorced. Orientals also have the lowest rates of marital dissolution, but for different reasons. Their particular cultural orientation which emphasizes marriage as a life-long bond (or beyond lifetime) appears to have been transferred to and persist among oriental ethnics.

In Table 4 we turn to the age distribution of the various ethnic identification groups. Agains, there is a distinctive difference between Oriental and Europeans. In general, Europeans are older than Orientals, which may be a reflection of either higher fertility of the home country (yielding a younger population structure) or immigration pattern or both. Among the remaining ethnics, Polish is the oldest group (half of the

---

[7]Duals are those who have multiple ethnic identification.

TABLE 3. DISTRIBUTION OF ETHNIC GROUPS BY MARITAL STATUS

COUNT / ROW PCT	SINGLE 1	MARRIED 2	COMMON LAW 3	DIVORCED 4	SEPARATED 5	WIDOWED 6	ROW TOTAL
1 CANADIAN	290 23 6	661 53 7	69 5 6	80 6 5	47 3 8	84 6 8	1231 49 2
2 BRITISH	62 15 1	239 57 9	22 5 3	28 6 8	11 2 7	31 7 5	413 16 5
3 FRENCH	25 27 2	45 48 9	8 8 6	5 5 4	5 5 4	3 3 3	93 3 7
4 UKRAINIAN	45 21 8	123 59 7	5 2 4	11 5 3	8 3 9	14 6 8	206 8 2
5 ITALIAN	6 18 8	26 78 1	0 0 0	1 3 1	0 0 0	1 3 1	32 1 3
6 GERMAN	34 23 6	90 62 5	5 3 5	4 2 8	4 2 8	7 4 9	144 5 8
7 HUNGARIAN	0 0 0	5 100 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	5 0 2
8 POLISH	7 18 4	23 60 5	1 2 6	1 2 6	1 2 6	5 13 2	38 1 5
9 SCANDINAVIAN	13 23 2	31 55 4	1 1 8	7 12 5	1 1 8	3 5 4	56 2 2
10 N AMERICAN	2 10 0	12 60 0	2 10 0	2 10 0	2 10 0	0 0 0	20 0 8
11 EAST INDIAN	6 20 0	21 70 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 3 3	2 6 7	30 1 2
12 DUTCH	6 17 6	20 58 8	0 0 0	1 2 9	1 2 9	6 17 6	34 1 4
13 CZECH	0 0 0	3 50 0	0 0 0	1 16 7	1 16 7	1 16 7	6 0 2
14 JAPANESE	1 50 0	1 50 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 0 1
15 CHINESE	16 38 1	24 57 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 2 4	1 2 4	42 1 7
16 NATIVE INDIAN	5 22 7	6 27 3	8 36 4	2 9 1	1 4 5	0 0 0	22 0 9
17 AFRICAN	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 100 0	0 0 0	1 0 0
18 RUSSIAN	1 12 5	5 62 5	1 12 5	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 12 5	8 0 3
19 JEWISH	2 25 0	5 62 5	1 12 5	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	8 0 3
20 OTHER ASIAN	3 25 0	7 58 3	0 0 0	1 8 3	1 8 3	0 0 0	12 0 5
21 OTHER EUROPEAN	3 11 1	19 70 4	0 0 0	3 11 1	1 3 7	1 3 7	27 1 1
22 DUAL	20 31 7	30 47 6	4 6 3	5 7 9	1 1 6	3 4 8	63 2 5
88 DK	3 30 0	5 50 0	0 0 0	1 10 0	0 0 0	1 10 0	10 0 4
COLUMN TOTAL	569 22 7	1401 55 0	128 5 1	153 6 1	88 3 5	164 6 6	2503 100 0

TABLE 4. DISTRIBUTION OF ETHNIC GROUPS BY AGE

	COUNT / ROW PCT	AGE 10s	20s	30s	40s	50s	60s	70s	80s	90s	ROW TOTAL
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
CANADIAN	1	46 3.7	439 35.7	243 19.7	162 13.2	162 13.2	103 8.4	55 4.5	13 1.1	6 0.5	1231 49.2
BRITISH	2	8 1.9	139 33.7	87 21.1	50 12.1	62 15.0	35 8.5	35 8.1	5 1.2	2 0.5	413 16.5
FRENCH	3	3 3.3	31 33.7	27 29.3	16 17.4	7 7.6	5 5.5	2 2.2	0 0.0	0 0.0	92 3.7
UKRAINIAN	4	8 3.9	52 25.2	42 20.4	24 11.7	33 16.0	26 12.6	17 8.3	3 1.5	1 0.5	206 8.2
ITALIAN	5	0 0.0	8 25.0	8 25.0	8 25.0	4 12.5	4 12.5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	32 1.3
GERMAN	6	8 5.6	46 31.9	24 16.7	30 20.8	14 9.7	12 8.3	8 5.6	1 0.7	1 0.7	144 5.8
HUNGARIAN	7	0 0.0	3 50.0	0 0.0	2 33.3	1 16.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	6 0.2
POLISH	8	2 5.3	7 18.4	5 13.2	5 13.2	7 18.4	8 21.1	4 10.5	0 0.0	0 0.0	38 1.5
SCANDINAVIAN	9	3 5.4	11 19.6	9 16.1	10 17.9	16 28.6	3 5.4	3 5.4	1 1.8	0 0.0	56 2.2
N AMERICAN	10	2 10.0	7 35.0	7 35.0	1 5.0	2 10.0	1 5.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	20 0.8
EAST INDIAN	11	0 0.0	8 26.7	16 53.3	4 13.3	1 3.3	1 3.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	30 1.2
DUTCH	12	1 2.9	9 26.5	6 17.6	3 8.8	5 14.7	9 26.5	1 2.9	0 0.0	0 0.0	34 1.4
CZECH	13	0 0.0	2 33.3	2 33.3	1 16.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 16.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	6 0.2
JAPANESE	14	0 0.0	1 50.0	0 0.0	1 50.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 0.1
CHINESE	15	5 11.9	16 38.1	12 28.6	4 9.5	2 4.8	1 2.4	2 4.8	0 0.0	0 0.0	42 1.7
NATIVE INDIAN	16	2 9.1	9 40.9	5 22.7	3 13.6	2 9.1	1 4.5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	22 0.9
AFRICAN	17	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 100.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 0.0
RUSSIAN	18	1 12.5	1 12.5	5 62.5	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 12.5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	8 0.3
JEWISH	19	0 0.0	4 50.0	2 25.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 12.5	1 12.5	0 0.0	0 0.0	8 0.3
OTHER ASIAN	20	0 0.0	6 50.0	4 33.3	2 16.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	12 0.5
OTHER EUROPEAN	21	0 0.0	6 22.2	7 25.9	7 25.9	5 18.5	0 0.0	2 7.4	0 0.0	0 0.0	27 1.1
DUAL	22	3 4.8	23 36.5	15 23.8	8 12.7	6 9.5	3 4.8	4 6.3	1 1.6	0 0.0	63 2.5
DK	88	1 10.0	4 40.0	3 30.0	0 0.0	1 10.0	0 0.0	1 10.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	10 0.4
	COLUMN TOTAL	83 3.7	832 33.2	530 21.2	341 13.6	330 13.2	216 8.6	126 5.0	24 1.0	12 0.5	2503 100.0

respondents are 50 and over); Canadians and North America, the youngest.[8] Among Orientals, no ethnic group has a high percentage of older members; East Indians are the youngest with 80 percent in the thirties and under. Native People were close to European ethnics in the marital status distribution. In their age composition, however, they are very similar to Orientals.

Table 5 presents the religious affiliations of ethnic groups. For Canadians and British, 'Protestant' is the most common religion, but they are dispersed over various denomications. These groups also indicate a moderate to high degree of no religious affiliation. North American group also has a distribution of religion similar to Canadian with the exception being more people in the category of no affiliation. For the remaining ethnic groups, the distribution produces results close to the stereotypic description of the mother countries. For those who identify with French, Italian, Hungarian, and Polish, Roman Catholic is the major religion with more than two to three quarter of the respondents falling in this category. Fifty percent of the Ukrainians are either Greek Orthodox or Ukrainian Catholic, with the remaining 50 percent divided into other categories. Among Germans and Scandinavians, Lutheran is the largest single denomination, but less than 40 percent of these two groups fall into this category.

---

[8] In an Edmonton study, it is found that the degree of Canadian identification increases from the first to the third generation. Non-Canadian identification, on the contrary, decreases from the first to the third generation (Borowski, 1981). These trends, however, do not continue to the fourth generation.

TABLE 5. DISTRIBUTION OF ETHNIC GROUPS BY RELIGION

	COUNT / ROW PCT	PRESBYTERIAN 10	ROMAN CATHOLIC 11	SALVATION 12	UKRAINIAN CATHOL 13	UNITED CHURCH 14	PROTESTANT UNSPE 15	CHRISTIAN UNSP 16	EASTERN RELIGION 17	MOSLEM 18	CHRISTIAN 19	ROW TOTAL
CANADIAN	1	33 2.7	240 19.6	1 0.1	18 1.5	227 18.4	118 9.6	34 2.8	11 0.9	1 0.1	0 0.0	1224 49.1
BRITISH	2	13 3.2	66 16.0	2 0.5	0 0.0	114 27.7	34 8.3	12 2.9	4 1.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	412 16.5
FRENCH	3	1 1.1	68 71.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 2.2	1 1.1	2 2.2	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	93 3.7
UKRAINIAN	4	0 0.0	30 14.6	0 0.0	55 26.7	19 9.2	20 9.7	4 1.9	2 1.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	205 8.3
ITALIAN	5	0 0.0	27 84.4	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 3.1	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 3.1	0 0.0	0 0.0	32 1.3
GERMAN	6	1 0.7	35 24.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	6 4.2	8 5.6	3 2.1	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	144 5.8
HUNGARIAN	7	0 0.0	4 66.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	6 0.2
POLISH	8	0 0.0	31 81.6	0 0.0	1 2.6	1 2.6	2 5.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	38 1.5
SCANDINAVIAN	9	0 0.0	3 5.4	0 0.0	0 0.0	13 23.2	6 10.7	0 0.0	1 1.8	0 0.0	0 0.0	56 2.2
N AMERICAN	10	1 5.0	2 10.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 10.0	4 20.0	2 10.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	20 0.8
EAST INDIAN	11	0 0.0	4 13.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 3.3	7 23.3	1 3.3	9 30.0	1 3.3	1 3.3	30 1.2
DUTCH	12	0 0.0	6 17.6	0 0.0	0 0.0	7 20.6	10 29.4	1 2.9	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 8.8	34 1.4
CZECH	13	1 20.0	2 40.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	5 0.2
JAPANESE	14	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 50.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 0.1
CHINESE	15	0 0.0	5 11.9	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 4.8	6 14.3	3 7.1	4 9.5	0 0.0	0 0.0	42 1.7
NATIVE INDIAN	16	0 0.0	11 50.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 4.5	2 9.1	1 4.5	1 4.5	0 0.0	0 0.0	22 0.9
AFRICAN	17	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 0.0
RUSSIAN	18	0 0.0	1 12.5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	8 0.3
JEWISH	19	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	8 0.3
OTHER ASIAN	20	0 0.0	8 66.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 8.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 8.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	12 0.5
OTHER EUROPEAN	21	0 0.0	10 38.5	0 0.0	1 3.8	2 7.7	1 3.8	1 3.8	0 0.0	1 3.8	0 0.0	26 1.0
DUAL	22	0 0.0	9 14.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	11 17.5	8 12.7	10 15.9	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	63 2.5
DK	88	0 0.0	4 40.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 10.0	1 10.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	10 0.4
	COLUMN TOTAL	80 3.2	564 22.6	3 0.1	75 3.0	420 16.8	226 9.1	75 3.0	35 1.4	3 0.1	4 0.2	2493 100.0

Continued ...

TABLE 5. DISTRIBUTION OF ETHNIC GROUPS BY RELIGION
(Concluded)

	COUNT / ROW PCT	NO AFFILIATION 1	ANGLICAN 2	BAPTIST 3	GREEK OR THODOX 4	JEWISH 5	LUTHERAN 6	MENNONITE 7	MORMON 8	PENTICOSTAL 9	JEHOVAH'S WITNESS 10	ROW TOTAL
CANADIAN	1	280 27.2	83 7.8	28 2.3	21 1.7	8 0.7	70 5.7	3 0.2	6 0.5	22 1.8	6 0.4	1224 49.1
BRITISH	2	83 15.0	87 15.3	13 3.2	1 0.2	0 0.0	8 1.5	1 0.2	11 2.7	3 0.5	1 0.2	413 16.5
FRENCH	3	17 16.5	1 1.1	1 1.1	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 1.1	93 3.7
UKRAINIAN	4	21 10.2	5 2.4	2 1.0	41 19.9	0 0.0	2 1.0	1 0.5	1 0.5	3 1.5	0 0.0	206 8.3
ITALIAN	5	3 9.4	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	32 1.3
GERMAN	6	19 13.2	2 1.4	8 5.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	53 36.8	4 2.8	1 0.7	4 2.8	0 0.0	144 5.8
HUNGARIAN	7	1 16.7	1 16.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	6 0.2
POLISH	8	1 3.6	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 3.6	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 3.6	0 0.0	28 1.1
SCANDINAVIAN	9	7 12.5	6 10.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	17 30.4	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 1.8	2 3.6	56 2.2
N AMERICAN	10	7 35.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 5.0	1 5.0	0 0.0	20 0.8
EAST INDIAN	11	4 13.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 6.7	30 1.2
DUTCH	12	5 14.7	0 0.0	1 2.9	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 2.9	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	34 1.4
CZECH	13	1 20.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 20.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	5 0.2
JAPANESE	14	1 50.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 0.1
CHINESE	15	20 47.6	0 0.0	2 4.8	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	42 1.7
NATIVE INDIAN	16	8 27.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	22 0.9
AFRICAN	17	1 100.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 0.0
RUSSIAN	18	3 37.5	0 0.0	1 12.5	1 12.5	1 12.5	1 12.5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	8 0.3
JEWISH	19	2 25.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	6 75.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	8 0.3
OTHER ASIAN	20	3 18.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	12 0.5
OTHER EUROPEAN	21	3 11.5	0 0.0	0 0.0	4 15.3	1 3.8	1 3.8	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	26 1.0
DUAL	22	11 17.5	1 1.5	3 4.8	1 1.5	0 0.0	1 1.5	0 0.0	1 1.5	0 0.0	3 4.8	63 2.5
DK	99	3 30.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 10.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	10 0.4
	COLUMN TOTAL	650 18.5	180 7.2	80 3.4	71 2.8	16 0.6	181 8.1	10 0.4	23 0.9	35 1.4	16 0.6	2493 100.0

The Dutch are spead across the different denominations of Protestant, with the largest group being that of unspecified Protestant. A large proportion of Native People (50%) belongs to the category of Roman Catholic, yet more than a quarter expressed that they do not have any religious affiliation. Still it is Chinese who have the highest proportion of respondents in the category of no affiliation. This might be due to the fact that Confucianism, which is a religion in many respects, is considered by Chinese not so much a religion as a way of life.

With regard to the practice of one's religion, those ethnic groups where the majority are clearly Roman Catholic exhibit strong participatory religiosity (Table 6). Thus, Italians, Polish, French all have the largest proportion of respondents belonging to the category, actively religious. East Indians and Dutch also display strong religiosity.

III. Socioeconomic Characteristics

Studies of ethnicity in Canada and the US have been dominated by the debate between the assimilationist and pluralist perspective. While the assimilationist believes that the forces of assimilation would be irresistable in the long run, the pluralist posits that ethnic differentiation could remain a fundamental feature of North American life. Neither of these two positions, however, offer a satisfactory and coherent account of ethnicity in Canada. A chief difficulty with both perspectives is the monolithic conception of assimilation they share (Alba and Chamlin, 1983). A realistic description of ethnicity in Canada

TABLE 6. DISTRIBUTION OF ETHNIC GROUPS BY RELIGIOSITY (%)

	STRONG	NOT VERY STRONG	SOMEWHAT STRONG	TOTAL
CANADIAN	26.1	59.4	14.5	674
BRITISH	28.5	61.5	10.0	239
FRENCH	37.3	35.1	27.6	59
UKRAINIAN	32.6	56.3	11.1	135
ITALIAN	45.0	30.0	25.0	20
GERMAN	33.0	52.7	14.3	91
HUNGARIAN	33.3	33.3	33.3	3
POLISH	53.3	36.7	10.0	30
SCANDINAVIAN	20.0	62.5	17.5	40
N. AMERICAN	27.3	54.5	18.2	11
EAST INDIAN	52.2	26.1	21.7	23
DUTCH	68.2	27.3	4.5	22
CZECH	16.7	66.7	16.7	6
JAPANESE	0.0	100.0	0.0	1
CHINESE	23.5	58.8	17.7	17
NATIVES	20.0	70.0	10.0	10
RUSSIAN	0.0	100.0	0.0	2
JEWISH	40.0	20.0	40.0	5
OTHER ASIAN	60.0	40.0	0.0	10
OTHER EUROP.	45.8	50.0	4.2	24
DUAL	38.9	50.0	11.1	54

requires a more complex conception, such as Gordon's (1964) in which assimilation occurs among several different dimensions that can operate to some degree independently of each other. In particular, Gordon distinguishes acculturation (the acquisition by an individual or group of the culture of the host society), structural assimilation (entry into primary relationship with others who are outside the group, which includes integration into the mainstream of the host society) and identificational assimilation (the loss of a distinctive group identity). In the following sections, we will discuss some aspects of structural assimilation, especially the educational and economic differences among the various ethnic groups. The primary concern being whether these differences diminish as identificational assimilation and acculturation increase. We will also explore whether differences in income appear as a function of differences in education and age.

1. Educational Attainment and Income

In Table 7, we present the characteristics of the various ethnic groups in terms of educational attainment. Regarding the amount of schooling, it is apparent that the Jewish, North American, Oriental groups have the greatest advantage, while the Native People have the least educational advantage. Next in descending order it is the British, Other European, and Canadian who exhibit the highest educational attainment, with the French, Scandinavian, Germans following respectively. At the lower end of the scale are Italians, Dutch, Ukrainians, and Polish. This

TABLE 7. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF VARIOUS ETHNIC GROUPS* (%)

	LESS THAN HIGH SCH.	HIGH SCHOOL	SOME COLL. OR UNIV.	BACHELOR'S DEGREE	GRAD. OR PROF. DEG.	MEAN YEARS OF SCHOOLING
CANADIAN	31.3	30.3	23.3	11.0	3.9	13.02
BRITISH	25.9	29.3	27.4	11.4	6.0	13.06
FRENCH	39.2	26.1	21.7	10.9	2.2	12.21
UKRAINIAN	45.1	22.3	23.3	6.3	3.0	11.64
ITALIAN	40.8	34.4	18.8	3.1	3.1	11.34
GERMAN	39.2	27.3	23.1	4.9	5.6	12.19
POLISH	47.4	18.4	31.6	0.0	2.6	11.00
SCANDINAVIAN	34.2	26.8	30.4	3.6	7.2	12.63
N. AMERICAN	15.0	10.0	30.0	25.0	20.0	15.75
EAST INDIAN	13.3	26.7	23.3	16.7	20.0	14.80
DUTCH	52.8	26.5	17.6	0.0	2.9	11.29
CHINESE	31.1	11.9	40.5	7.1	9.5	13.02
NATIVES	54.5	27.3	13.6	4.5	0.0	11.09
RUSSIAN	12.5	25.0	12.5	25.0	25.0	14.25
JEWISH	0.0	37.5	12.5	25.0	25.0	15.25
OTHER ASIAN	0.0	8.3	16.7	58.3	8.3	15.17
OTHER EUROP.	29.6	18.5	37.0	11.1	3.7	13.50
DUAL	30.2	12.7	34.9	17.5	5.8	13.49

*Four ethnic groups are excluded from this table and the rest of the discussion, as their numbers are too small to permit further analyses.

finding is also reiterated in the other measure of education, completion of formal educational institution, in the second column in Table 7.

These educational advantages and disadvantages for certain ethnic groups are translated into income distribution (Table 8). While the Jewish have the highest proportion in the upper class, Ukrainians and Italians fall below the average in income. The income level of other European ethnics with educational disadvantage, the Poles and Dutch falls even further below the average. Indeed, the Dutch have an income level lower than that of Native People, who have the lowest educational achievement [9]. While Orientals have a greater educational advantage, their income distribution is not uniform. East Indians and Other Asian group in general indicate excellent income performance; however, the Chinese have only 17.5 percent in the upper class and overall below-average income level (3.1 vs 3.2). The most puzzling inconsistency between education and income, however, is displayed by the Russian group. Their average educational attainment is one of the top but their performance in income distribution in terms of the proportion in the upper class is poor[10] (12.5%, which is even lower than that of Native People.) The major ethnic group in Canada, British, is high on the list of income performance, only topped by North American and Duals group.

---

[9]It might be that the Dutch are in general going through identificational assimilation faster than any other ethnics. The income performance of the Dutch, if grouped by ethnic origin, is close to that of the British.

[10]It may be that Russians are the most recent immigrants in Edmonton.

TABLE 8. INCOME DISTRIBUTION OF VARIOUS ETHNIC GROUPS (%)

	LOWER CLASS(1)	WORKING CLASS(2)	LOWER MIDDLE CLASS(3)	UPPER MIDDLE CLASS(4)	UPPER CLASS(5)	UPPER UPPER CLASS(6)	MEAN	STANDARDIZED MEAN
CANADIAN	18.5	18.1	20.0	19.2	15.8	8.4	3.21	3.21
BRITISH	17.4	15.0	18.7	21.0	16.3	11.7	3.39	3.33
FRENCH	17.2	20.7	12.6	21.8	14.9	12.6	3.34	3.42
UKRAINIAN	23.2	18.2	14.6	18.2	17.7	8.1	3.13	3.30
ITALIAN	16.7	10.0	40.0	13.3	20.0	0.0	3.10	3.38
GERMAN	22.1	14.5	22.1	19.8	14.5	6.9	3.11	3.01
POLISH	29.7	18.9	16.2	13.5	13.5	8.1	2.86	3.15
SCANDINAVIAN	23.2	14.3	25.0	16.1	16.1	5.4	3.04	3.07
N. AMERICAN	5.3	5.3	15.8	36.8	15.8	21.1	4.16	4.52
EAST INDIAN	27.6	3.2	24.1	10.3	27.6	6.9	3.28	3.07
DUTCH	18.2	30.3	18.2	24.2	9.1	0.0	2.76	2.91
CHINESE	10.5	26.3	23.7	23.7	13.2	2.6	3.11	3.04
NATIVES	19.0	28.6	23.8	14.3	4.8	9.5	2.86	2.88
RUSSIAN	0.0	37.5	0.0	50.0	12.5	0.0	3.38	3.38
JEWISH	12.5	12.5	37.5	0.0	17.5	25.9	3.63	3.52
OTHER ASIAN	0.0	9.1	27.3	27.3	9.1	27.3	4.18	3.79
OTHER EUROP.	13.0	8.7	26.1	21.7	17.4	13.0	3.61	3.55
DUAL	16.1	14.3	16.1	17.9	21.4	14.3	3.57	3.44

*Base Population: Canadian

To assess the role of educational achievement in ethnic differences of income, we have calculated income levels using a standardization technique (Table 8).[11] Standardization has little effect of the mean scores of the British, Scandianvian, Russian, and Other Europeans (less than .05 difference). Germans, Jewish, and Orientals have actually lower mean income scores that their original, which results from the fact that their educational structure is more favorable (higher attainment) than the Canadians. For Polish, Ukrainian and Italian groups, it appears that their disadvantage in education carries over to their income performance. For North Americans, their earnings per education unit is higher that that of the Canadian group. Thus even though their educational achievement is lower, their average income level is higher than Canadians. On the contrary, Native People display doubly disadvantageous positions with regard to education and income. Their income level per education unit is by far lower and their overall educational achievement is much less favorable than those of Canadians.

2. Generational Mobility in Education and Income

It is appropriate to question whether the surprising performance of some ethnic groups may be the result of a structural assimilation whereby the children and grandchildren of

---

[11]The standard population is that of the Canadian group. The figures in Table 8, therefore, refer to the average income level when every ethnic group has an educational composition equal to that of the Canadian group. When the score of a group is different from that of its original in Table 7, it is due to either unfavorable educational compositon (i.e., low level of educational attainment) or lower income per educational attainment unit.

immigrants have not only achieved parity in Canadian society, but also have actually managed to fight their way to the middle or even to the top of the structural ladder. In Table 9, we turn to a cross-sectional analysis which will hopefully throw some light on the issue of mobility. Each ethnic group is divided into age cohorts and then compared with the mean score for its own age group. It is a well known fact that the general educational level in Canada has gone up, with younger people having a far higher average educational attainment than older generation. For example, learning that younger Ukrainian Canadians have more education than older Ukrainian Canadians would not prove structural assimilation or acculturation. Rather, if the relative position of Ukrainians improved in the younger age group, then we can point to relative Ukrainian improvement and to an indication of Ukrainian structural assimilation to Canadian society, at least in the level of education.

In Table 9 we present the cohort mean for four age cohorts of each of the Edmonton ethnic groups. It appears that there are several discernible patterns emerging in educational mobility. Firstly, six ethnic groups are above the cohort mean of the Canadian ethnic group at each level. They are Jewish, British, North American, East Indian, Other Asians and Duals. However, except for East Indians, no ethnic groups show a clear upward mobility with age. This may be due to a ceiling effect, i.e., there is not much room to go when they are already well ahead at each age cohort. Secondly, the remaining groups exhibit moderate to high degrees of educational mobility with age. It is mostly

TABLE 9. MEAN YEARS OF SCHOOLING OF AGE COHORTS

	THIRTIES & YOUNGER	FORTIES	FIFTIES	SIXTIES & OLDER
CANADIAN	13.68	13.56	12.47	10.29
BRITISH	13.87	13.96	12.64	13.04
FRENCH	12.87	12.13	11.14	8.25
UKRAINIAN	13.47	13.21	10.39	7.72
ITALIAN	13.00	9.13	9.75	10.75
GERMAN	12.94	13.43	10.93	8.68
POLISH	12.64	13.60	10.29	7.50
SCANDINAVIAN	13.52	13.70	10.75	12.43
N. AMERICAN	15.56	20.00	14.00	18.00
EAST INDIAN	15.04	14.75	14.00	12.00
DUTCH	12.50	10.67	9.60	10.40
CHINESE	14.58	5.50	13.00	6.00
NATIVES	13.00	6.67	6.00	4.00
RUSSIAN	15.00	-	-	9.00
JEWISH	15.67	-	-	16.00
OTHER ASIAN	14.90	16.50	-	-
OTHER EUROP.	13.92	12.14	12.80	4.00
DUAL	13.73	15.13	13.50	10.63

the ethnic groups that have the youngest age cohort (thirties and below) with the highest level of educational attainment. Of those groups whose older cohort member have less education than the Canadian group, the Ukrainian and Chinese groups actually approximate and ultimately surpass respectively the Canadian group in terms of education achieved. Thirdly, some groups, in particular, Polish, Dutch, Italian, French, and Native People remain below the Canadian level at the youngest age cohort. Finally, the most remarkable improvement in terms of schooling is made by Native People. At the older age, the difference is more than 6 years of schooling, but the at the younger age (thirties and below), the difference is less than one year.

Let us now turn to the issue of parity in income (Table 10). The educational advantage of certain ethnic groups have not necessarily produced corresponding increase in income at each age interval. While Jewish, British, North American, Other Asians and Duals groups are above the Canadian cohort mean at most of age cohorts, East Indian is ahead only for the youngest age cohort. Indeed most lower income groups, i.e., French, Ukrainian, Italian, Polish, do better at youngest age interval, with the only exception being Native People: The lower income of younger Native People may indicate that they are being paid lower per education unit. However, it may also be the case that Native People are employed in jobs which do not match (i.e., fall short of) their educational level.

3. Importance of Ethnic Identity

TABLE 10. MEAN INCOME LEVEL OF AGE COHORTS

	THIRTIES & YOUNGER	FORTIES	FIFTIES	SIXTIES & OLDER
CANADIANS	3.30	3.71	3.40	2.18
BRITISH	3.39	4.26	4.09	1.98
FRENCH	3.51	3.29	2.83	2.63
UKRAINIAN	3.63	3.42	3.09	1.93
ITALIAN	3.60	3.43	2.50	1.25
GERMAN	3.20	3.30	4.23	1.53
POLISH	3.50	4.80	2.57	1.36
SCANDINAVIAN	2.96	3.50	3.38	1.86
N. AMERICAN	4.13	4.00	6.00	1.00
EAST INDIAN	3.43	3.00	3.00	1.00
DUTCH	2.94	4.33	2.40	2.11
CHINESE	3.23	3.00	2.50	2.00
NATIVES	2.75	4.33	1.00	2.00
RUSSIAN	3.57	-	-	2.00
JEWISH	3.83	-	-	3.00
OTHER ASIAN	4.00	5.00	-	-
OTHER EUROP.	3.45	4.43	4.00	1.00
DUAL	3.56	4.29	4.33	2.29

The majority of ethnic studies define ethnic group status solely in terms of its socioeconomic status, i.e., as income increases status incrases (Gordon, 1964). Other writers, however, argue that ethnic groups constitute status groups ranked in their own right, which form a stratification system paralleling to that of socioeconomic status (Shibutani and Kwan, 1965). Pineo (1977) in his discussion of the role of ethnicity in Canadian social stratification lends support to the latter definition of status, as he reports that ethnicity is viewed, in and of itself, as an evaluative criterion by Canadians.[12]

If it is presumed that ethnic group membership can influence both directly and indirectly the social standing of an individual, then the perception of the importance of one's ethnic identity can be derived in large part from social ranking of the group with which one is identified. To put it differently, would ethnicity matter more for high ranking group members or for low ranking group members?

Table 11 presents the average level of perceived importance of one's ethnic identity.[13] Overall, most ethnic groups consider their ethnic identity as important; however, there is quite a variability. The North American and Duals groups seem to be least concerned about their ethnic identity. Among single ethnic groups, British, Dutch, German, and Scandiavian are less conscious of their ethnic identity. These groups represent higher

---

[12]There are discrepancies between Anglophone and Francophone Canadians with regard to the relative standings of certain ethnic groups. These discrepancies are particularly noticeable for British vs. French Canadians.

[13]The scale varies from 1 to 7. The higher the mean, the more importance one attaches to ethnic identity.

TABLE 11. IMPORTANCE OF ETHNIC IDENTITY

	IMPORTANT (%)	MEAN
CANADIAN	67.8	5.2
BRITISH	52.0	4.5
FRENCH	69.6	5.3
UKRAINIAN	66.4	5.1
ITALIAN	85.7	5.9
GERMAN	52.2	4.5
POLISH	68.9	5.1
SCANDINAVIAN	48.8	4.3
N. AMERICAN	33.4	3.7
EAST INDIAN	85.0	6.1
DUTCH	47.1	4.8
CHINESE	76.6	5.6
NATIVES	71.4	5.4
RUSSIAN	71.5	5.3
JEWISH	85.8	5.9
OTHER ASIAN	75.0	5.4
OTHER EUROP.	59.2	5.1
DUAL	41.3	4.1

ranking ethnics: the British being considered most prestigeous, whereas the Dutch have the highest standing among European groups (even higher than French Canadians), followed closely by the Scandinavians. Germans, however, have relatively lower standing and may be less conscious of their ethnicity for a variety of reasons. Conceivably, the unpleasant image associated with its mother country during two World Wars may have an impact here. Indeed Greeley (1974) noted that German Americans had, as a group, lost their rich cultural practice after WWI and WWII, thereby undergoing identificational assimilation faster than other European ethnic groups.

In contrast, the most ethnicity-conscious group, Orientals, are at the lower end of the status scale (see Table 1 and Chart 2 in Pineo, 1977). Among European groups, Italians and Jewish are very highly concerned with their ethnic identity and are similarly placed at the lower end of the status scale. The Polish, however, are less conscious of their ethnicity, even though their ranking is lower than either Italians and Jewish. French and Native People are also highly aware of their ethnicity as well as being fairly low and quite low respectively on the status scale. The repeated association between high ethnic consciousness and low social status naturally leads one to presume some adaptive social psychological process in operation.

While no status category exists for the group Canadian, Canadians as a group have been evaluated in terms of ethnic identification. It may be that, irrespective of ethnic origins, once people classify themselves as 'Canadian', they attribute

more significance to their ethnic identity than the dominant British group.

IV. Ethnicity and Community Affect

Social cohesion in the community contributes to both positive community affect and involvement in the community activities, such as voluntary organization participation. The debate as to the exact causal relationship between social status, social cohesion and community affect continues in the literature (Greer, 1960: Yancey, 1971). Nontheless, there are some findings linking social cohesion and community affect to stages in the life cycle (Gans, 1962; Athanasious and Yoshioka, 1973) as well as to dwelling types (Michelson, 1970: Kennedy, 1978). Such studies, however, ignored the fact that ethnicity is a relevant variable in social cohesion and community affect. For ethnicity influences most of the demographic and residential factors which are found to be related to social cohesion, activity, and affect for the community (Greenbaum and Greenbaum, 1981). In this section, we will analyze the EAS data for each ethnic group in order to determine if and/or how the predictors operate for each ethnic group.

Three sets of predictors for community affect were chosen for the analysis: (1) demographic backgrounds such as age, education, schooling and income, in order to explore whether the stages of the life cycle (age) and socioeconomic status (education, schooling and income) influence the level of community affect; (2) social activity, i.e., how often an

individual spends a social evening with friends or relatives; (3)neighborhood cohesion, or how many adults an individual knows by name and converses with in his neighborhood. Community affect was measured by an individual's satisfaction with neighbors.

In Table 12, the results of a multiple regression analysis are presented. The figures in this table stand for multiple R squares or the percent of explained variance of community affect by the combination of preditor variables. For instance, the 10.8 in the fourth column of Table 12 means that 10.8% of the variance of community affect has been accounted for by all the predictors combined. Among ethnic groups, our model provides the best explanations for the Slavic and Northern European group. In particular, it appears that demographic background variables (i.e., age, education, etc.) are the best predictors for Northern Europeans, whereas neighborhood cohesion and social activity play quite an important role in community affect for the Slavic group.

For the remaining ethnics, our model displays a low to moderate success in accounting for community affect. Demographic variables are the best predictors for French, Canadian, British and German groups. However, community affect for Ukrainians appears to be based upon both demographic variables and neighborhood cohesion. Duals are the only group showing a strong social activity influence on community affect. Our model, however, appears to be inapplicable to Orientals. One explanation for this may be high variation within the Oriental group (which cannot be probed further here given the small sample sizes for each ethnic group).

TABLE 12. CONTRIBUTION OF DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUNDS, SOCIAL ACTIVITY, AND NEIGHBORHOOD COHESION IN THE MULTIPLE REGRESSION MODEL FOR COMMUNITY AFFECT

	DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUNDS	SOCIAL ACTIVITY	NEIGHBORHOOD COHESION	TOTAL VARIANCE EXPLAINED BY MRA
CANADIAN (1149)	7.7	0.3	2.8	10.8**
BRITISH (384)	6.4	0.3	3.1	9.8**
FRENCH (87)	14.1	0.1	1.9	16.1
UKRAINIAN (197)	3.8	1.2	2.3	7.3
GERMAN (130)	8.7	1.0	0.9	10.6
SLAVIC (87)	14.5	7.4	8.8	30.7**
N. EUROPEAN (89)	25.2	1.1	0.6	26.9**
ORIENTALS (79)	0.8	0.01	1.0	1.8
DUAL (56)	3.3	4.8	1.2	9.3

**Significant at 1% level.

V. Summary and Conclusion

Ethnic diversity permeates Edmonton. There are differentials in attitudinal and behavioral traits that correlate with the specific variants of ethnic identification. The issue often arises here as to the seemingly contradicting relationship between unity (or assimilation) and pluralism. The right question, however, is not whether pluralism works for or against assimilation, but rather how does a pluralistic society achieve harmony. To put it differently, it appears desirable to achieve structural assimilation without cultural homogenization.

There are several findings which can shed light on this concern. First, Canadian society is ostensibly working toward structural assimilation by improving the conditions related to social stratification. At least in Edmonton, it appears that socioeconomic gaps between the dominant British and other ethnic groups are lessening, especially among the younger generation. In the case of some ethnics such as Native People, however, the process toward parity seems by far too slow. For instance, Caucasian groups with educational disadvantages can lift their educational level in order to achieve parity of income. The lower income level of Natives, however, is derived from both educational disadvantage and low income per education unit. Thus, improving educational attainment alone does not quarantee parity of income. Secondly, there are a group of people who go through a rather thorough process of identificational assimilation, thus becoming a distinctive group in many ways, i.e., 'Canadians'. The structural assimilation of this group is very high and, perhaps

not surprisingly, they do achieve parity in socioeconomic status with the dominant British group. Unlike the British, however, 'Canadians' perceive their ethnic identity as quite important. Thirdly, there seems to be a consistent relationship between high ethnic consciousness and low social status of an ethnic group, which may be attributed to some adaptive social psycological process on the part of what are largely visible minority groups. Finally, ethnic differences in factors influencing community affect indicate that mechanisms of cultural differentiation, among ethnic groups are more complex than a theoreical model such as ours can depict. These findings indicate the need for further and more detailed research on how different ethnic groups perceive and function in situations determining community affect.

REFERENCES

Alba, R.D. and M.B. Chamiin

1983 "Ethnic Identification among Whites," AMER. SOC. REV. 48:240-247.

Athanasiou, R. and G.A. Yoshioka

1973 "The Spatial Character of Friendship Formation," ENVIRONMENT AND BEHAVIOR 5:43-65.

Borowski, H.

1981 ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION IN A WESTERN CANADIAN CITY: AN EXPLORARY APPLICATION OF SEQUENTIAL SAMPLING. An Unpublished M.A. Thesis. University of Alberta.

Driedger, et al.

1982 "Ethnic Identification: Variations in Regional and National Preferences," CAN. ETHNIC STUDIES 13:57-68.

Dyck, N

1980 "Indian, Metis, Native: Some Implication of Special Status,"CAN. ETHNIC STUDIES 12:34-46.

Gans, H.J.

1962 "Urbanism and Sububanism as Ways of Life," pp. 625-648 in A.M. Rose (ed.) HUMAN BEHAVIOR AND SOCIAL PROCESSES. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin.

Gans, H.J.

1979 "Symbolic Ethnicity: the Future of Ethnic Groups and Cultures in America," ETHNIC AND RACIAL STUDIES 2:1-20.

Glazer, D.

1958 "Dynamics of Ethnic Identification," AMER. SOC. REV. 23:31-40.

Gordon, M.M.

1964 ASSIMILATION IN AMERICAN LIFE. NY: Oxford University Prss.

Greeley, A.M.

1974 ETHNICITY IN THE US: A PRELIMINARY RECONNAISSANCE. NY: Wiley.

Greenbaum, P.E. and S.D. Greenbaum

1981 "Territorial Personalization: Group Identity and Social Interaction in a Slavic-American Neighborhood." ENVIRONMENT AND BEHAVIOR 13:574-589.

Greer, C.

1974 DIVIDED SOCIETY: THE ETHNIC EXPERIENCE IN AMERICA. NY: Basic Books.

Greer, S.

1960 "The Social Structure and Political Process of Surburbia." AMEM. SOC. REV. 25:514-526.

Kennedy, L.W.

1978 "Environmental Opportunity and Social Contact: A True or Spurious Relationship," PACIFIC SOC. REV. 21:173-186.

Kuhn, M.H.

1964 "The Reference Gourp Reconsidered," SOC. QUARTERLY 5:6-21.

McKay, J.

1980 "Entity vs. Process Approaches to Ethnic Relations and Ethnic Identity," CAN. ETHNIC ST. 12:56-80.

Michelson, W.

1970 MAN AND HIS URBAN ENVIRONMENT. READING, MASS.:ADDISON-WESLEY.

Millet, D.

1981 "Defining the 'Dominant Group'," CAN. ETHNIC ST. 13:64-79.

Pineo, P.C.

1977 "The Social Standing of Ethnic and Racial Groupings," CAN. REV. SOC. ANTH. 14:147-157.

Porter, J.

1975 "Ethnic Pluralism in Canadian Perspective," pp. 267-304 in N. Glazer and D. Moynihan (eds.) ETHNICITY: THEORY AND EXPERIENCE. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Reitz, J.G.

1980 THE SURVIVAL OF ETHNIC GROUPS. Toronto:McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Shibutani, T.

1955 "Reference Groups as Perspectives," AMEM. J. SOC. 60:562-569.

Shibutani, T. and K.M. Kwan

1965 ETHNIC STRATIFICATION: A COMPARATIVE APPROACH. NY:McMillan.

Smith, T.W.

1980 "Ethnic Measurement and Identification," ETHNICITY 7:78-95.

Statistics Canada

1983 Population, Occupied Private Dwellings, Private Households and Census and Economic Families in Private Households: Selected Social and Economic Characteristics, Edmonton. Cat. # 95-949.

Statistics Canada

1984 1981 Census of Canada: Ethnic Origin.

Taylor, D.M. et al.

1979 "Cultural Insecurity and Attitudes Toward Multiculturalism and Ethnic Groups in Canada," CAN. ETHNIC ST. 11: 19-30.

Wilkinson, D.

1981 "Education and the Social Mobility of three Ethnic Groups: A Canadian Case Study," CAN. ETHNIC St. 13:61-72.

Yancey, W.L.

1971 "Architecture, Interaction, and Social Control," ENVIRONMENT AND BEHAVIOR 3:3-21.

Yancey, W.L. et al

1976 "Emergent Ethnicity: A Review and Reformulation," AMER. SOC. REV. 41:391-402.

EDMONTON AREA SERIES

NO.

16. Government Influence, Media Influence, and Quitting Smoking
Herbert C. Northcott and George Jarvis. December 1980.

17. Social Relations in Changing Communities: A New Test of Old Theories
L.W. Kennedy and D.W. Stokes. January 1981.

18. Women, Work, Health, & Happiness
Herbert C. Northcott. February 1981.

19. Determinants of Reported Seatbelt Use: Traditional Masculinity, Age, Marital Status, and Alcohol Consumption
W. Andrew Harrell. April 1981.

20. Selected Findings from the 1981 Edmonton Area Study
Clifford Kinzel. August 1981.

21. Why Wives Work: The Relative Effects of Situational and Attitudinal Factors
Graham S. Lowe and Harvey Krahn. October 1981.

22. Selected Findings From the 1981 Winnipeg Area Study
Raymond Currie and Charlene Thacker. April 1982.

23. Ethnic Identification: Variations in Regional and National Preferences
Leo Driedger, Charrlene Thacker, and Raymond Currie. July 1982.

24. Community Influences on Attitudes Towards Unions
Harvey Krahn and Graham S. Lowe. August 1982.

25. 1982 Edmonton Area Study Summary Report
Cliff Kinzel. September 1982.

26. Deterring Physician Utilization: Medical Care User Fees in Canada.
Herbert C. Northcott and Earle L. Snider. May, 1983.

27. Public Attitudes Towards Unions: Some Canadian Evidence.
Harvey Krahn and Graham S. Lowe. May 1983.

28. Rural-Urban Origins and Fear of Crime: The Case for 'Rural Baggage'
Leslie W. Kennedy and Harvey Krahn. July 1983.

29. 1983 Edmonton Area Study Sampling Report
Clifford Kinzel. July 1983.

30. "Age-Related Expectations Concerning the Effect of Presence of Children on the Subjective Structure of Life Satisfaction"
Charlene Thacker, Raymond Currie and Leo Driedger. December 1983.

31. The Social-Psychological Impact of Unemployment in Edmonton
Harvey Krahn, Graham S. Lowe and Julian Tanner. March 1984.

* Out of Print